



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,493	06/14/2001	Pankaj K. Jha	0325.00482	7913

21363 7590 08/27/2004

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.
24840 HARPER
ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,493

Applicant(s)

JHA, PANKAJ K.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 09/881367. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of independent claims 1, 10 are similar to claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/881367. The limitation "processing of first parameters in an incoming packet in accordance with pointer to produce a second parameter" is equivalent to the use of "processing first parameter of the packet in accordance with pointer to produce a second parameter". Use of database and circuits is well known in the art. The

Art Unit: 2154

limitations of dependent claims 2-9, 11-17, are similar to claims 2-15 of copending Application No. 09/881367.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

The following title is suggested: "Circuits of a network bridging device to support the networking protocol changes independent of the device firmware/hardware".

4. The "BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" section should contain brief description of the disclosed subject matter rather repetitive claimed language of the claims.

5. Line 16 of page 4, the term "an external circuit" should be "external peripherals". See figure 3.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set

Art. Unit: 2154

forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not contain key components of the invention and is not properly understood. Key terms involved in the invention like, parsing the frame parameter, assembling packets, protocol updates/modifications, networking protocols for WAN, LAN, use of router like devices for protocol processing, are missing in the abstract. The term "may" is not allowed. The abstract contains claim language and is limited to claim 1, which does not relay information of what the applicant has mentioned about the reasoning of the invention. Also the abstract does not clearly state the goal of the invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

7. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

8. New corrected drawings are required in this application because Figure 2 does not show "circuits", as disclosed at line 9, page 5 of the specification. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dietz et al.
(Hereinafter Dietz).

11. As per claims 1 and 10, Dietz teaches a circuit and an assembly as follows:

a database configured to store a pointer for each first parameter of a network protocol (e.g., use of CAM, figure 15, col., 21, lines 11 –24); and a processing circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57) configured to (i) process at least one of said first parameters an incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 16 – 34) and (ii) present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 51 – 67),

first circuit configured to delineate a receive frame from a first network having a network protocol to produce incoming packet (e.g., figure 15, col., 25, lines 41 - 57);

an second circuit configured to (i) store a pointer for each first parameter least one first parameter said network protocol (e.g., figure 15, , col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57),

Art Unit: 2154

(ii) process least one first parameter in said incoming packet with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14), (iii) present process at accordance an outgoing packet containing said second parameter (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 51 – 67, col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14), and

a third circuit configured to frame said outgoing packet to present a transmit frame to a second network (e.g., figure 15, , col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57).

12. As per claim 2, Dietz teaches the following:

database is further configured to store an offset and a length for each said first parameter (e.g., col., 19, lines 1 – 23), and said processing circuit is further configured partition said incoming packet accordance with said offsets and said lengths extract said first parameters (e.g., col., 19, lines 16 – 61).

13. As per claim 3, Dietz teaches the following:

an interface configured to download said offsets, said lengths, and said pointers for storage in said database (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57).

14. As per claim 4, Dietz teaches the following:

a parsing circuit configured to partition said incoming packet (e.g., figure 15, col., 32, lines 7 – 16); a plurality of peripheral blocks (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 58) each linked to said pointers and configured to perform a process involving said first parameters and an assembling circuit configured to generate said outgoing packet (e.g., figures 15-18B, col., 33, lines 16 – 34).

15. As per claim 5, Dietz teaches the following:

database is further configured to store second offset (e.g., col., 19, lines 1 – 23), a second length for each said second parameter of a second network protocol (e.g., col., 19, lines 16 – 61).

16. As per claim 6, Dietz teaches the following:

an interface connectable to a peripheral block external to said circuit (e.g., figure 15, col., 25, lines 41 - 57).

17. As per claim 7, Dietz teaches the following:

peripheral blocks are at least two circuits of addressable memory circuit, a parity circuit, a first-in-first-out circuit, time to live circuit, content comparison counter circuit, a value swapping circuit, a stuffing de-stuffing circuit, a cyclic redundancy checksum length construction generator circuit, synchronization circuit, a frame relay lookup circuit, a data link header error control connection identifier circuit, a protocol identification analysis circuit, a point-to-point protocol verification circuit, parameter discard circuit, and a buffer circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 3 – 38).

18. As per claim 8, Dietz teaches the following:

one peripheral block is configured to simultaneously processes a plurality of first parameters (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 15).

Art Unit: 2154

19. As per claim 9, Dietz teaches the following:
processing circuit is configured as only hardware (e.g., col., 25, lines 8 – 38).
20. As per claims 11-17, refer to claims 1-10 for rejection and combination of references.

Conclusion

21. Examiner makes a very clear note that the rational of the applicant's invention has been clearly anticipated by several references including form PTO-892 cited arts. Applicant's invention does contain few minor additional matters that facilitate the concepts of the applicant's invention. However, the additional minor matters are well known in the art.
22. The prior art made of record (Form PTO-892 and applicant submitted IDS) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is 703-605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hareesh Patel

August 24, 2004



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100